

## REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 13, 15, 16, and 21-33 are pending in the present Application. Claim 21 has been canceled, Claims 1, 4, 22, 24, 28, and 30, have been amended, and no claims have been added, leaving Claims 1-11, 13, 15, 16, and 22-33 for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment. A request for continued examination under 37 C.F.R. 1.114 accompanies this amendment.

### Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1, 24, 28, and 30 have each been amended to include the limitations of Claims 4 and 21, canceled herewith, additional support for which can be found at least in the Specification in paragraphs [0052] and [0053].

Claim 22 has been amended to correctly depend from Claim 1 based on the amendments to Claim 1 and the cancellation of Claim 21.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 13, 15, 16, and 21-28, 30, 32, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,849,926 to Park et al., hereinafter “Park”. Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over Park. Applicants respectfully traverse both of these rejections.

Park teaches a composite containing nano magnetic particles in a dielectric matrix. (Park, abstract). The composite comprises, in one embodiment, a dielectric matrix of silica, alumina, hydrosilsesquioxane, or an organic material such as polyimide, epoxy, polymethylmethacrylate (PMMA), or methyl silsesquioxane, and in a second embodiment, PMMA, hydrosilsesquioxane, and methyl silsesquioxane. Col. 3, lines 64-67 and Col. 9, lines 66-67. Park discloses preparation of a “polyimide” from a polyamic acid prepared by polycondensation of pyromellitic dianhydride, 3,3',4,4'-benzophenone tetracarboxylic dianhydride, and 4,4'-diaminodiphenylether. Col. 8, lines 25-45.

To anticipate a claim, a reference must teach every limitation of the claim. (MPEP 2131).

Independent Claims 1, 24, 28 and 30 have each been amended to claim an article coated with an electrically insulating layer which in turn comprises the thermosetting polymers recited in Claim 4, now canceled. Claims 1, 24, 28, and 30 as amended do not claim silica, alumina, hydrosilsesquioxane, methyl silsesquioxane, polyimide, epoxy, or PMMA. While the instant independent Claims 1, 24, 28, and 30 each claim silicones, one skilled in the art will appreciate that silicones, as further defined in instant Claim 5, differentiate from silsesquioxanes in the art as silicones comprise a backbone of dialkyl substituted siliconmonoxide repeating units having a general structure of  $-(Si(R)_2O)-$ , and are thereby derived principally from the hydrolytic polymerization of silicon reactive species having two reactive groups such as dimethyldimethoxysilane or dimethyldichlorosilane; whereas silsesquioxanes, which have the general structure  $-(SiRO_{1.5})-$  have backbones based on monosubstituted silicon and have three oxygen binding sites on the silicon, thereby deriving from monomers having three reactive groups on the silicon such as methyltrimethoxysilane or methyltrichlorosilane. For this reason alone, silicones are not an identical class of polymer as a silsesquioxane. Park does not disclose silicones, or the other polymers as instantly claimed in Claims 1, 24, 28, and 30, and therefore does not teach all elements of the instant claims. For this reason alone, Park cannot anticipate the instant claims.

Park also does not disclose an electrical conduction winding, stator bar, or a stator piece, and for this reason also, Park does not teach every limitation of independent Claims 1, 24, 28 and 30. Claims 3, 4, 9, 13, 15, 16, 22-23, 25-29, and 32-33 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1, 24, 28 and 30, thus are also patentable.

In addition, dependent Claim 21, which has been included in independent Claims 1, 24, 28, and 30, claims an article with an electrical breakdown strength of greater than or equal to about 0.75 kilovolt. Park does not disclose electrical breakdown strength, let alone an electrical breakdown strength of greater than or equal to about 0.75 kilovolt. As stated in the Final Office Action, the Examiner regards the limitations of Claim 21 to be inherent to the composition of the instant claims as Park, “considering the insulator taught by Park et al comprises the same materials and content as the instantly claimed invention”.

Final Office Action dated April 18, 2008, section 2, p. 3. Applicants respectfully note, without conceding the correctness of the Examiner's point, that this is now a moot point as the amendments to the independent Claims 1, 24, 28, and 30 clearly differentiate the composition of the instant Claims from that of Park.

In addition, regarding any potential obviousness rejection over Park, it is known that methyl silsesquioxane and hydrosilsesquioxane (also referred to as hydridosilsesquioxane) form rigid structures (i.e., "ladder" structures and "cage" structures) and having high modulus (i.e., is stiffer) and high interconnectivity relative to silicones, and thus have different properties than a silicone which typically has a low modulus (i.e., is less stiff), and therefore high modulus materials such as silsesquioxanes would be useful for forming spin-on dielectrics of the type disclosed in Park for use in dielectric films for semiconductor device or display devices. See Park, Col. 9, lines 46-51. One skilled in the art will readily appreciate that the articles disclosed in Park are further not identical or even comparable electrical components to electrical conduction windings, stator bars, or a stator pieces as claimed, none of which is a semiconductor of the type taught in Park. Park therefore does not teach an application that would suggest to one skilled in the art to modify Park with a silicone (rather than the disclosed silsesquioxane) polymer, or with a reasonable expectation for success.

Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections over Park, and allowance of Claims 1, 24, 28, and 30, and their dependents including Claim 2, is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 28-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) or (e), as allegedly anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,783,828 to Fujimaru, et al., hereinafter "Fujimaru". In addition, Claims 28-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly anticipated by JP 2002064276A to Masahiko et al., hereinafter "Masahiko". Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and address the rejections together.

Fujimaru teaches a resin composition having a phase separation structure having at least two phases and inorganic particles having a mean primary particle size of 0.1  $\mu\text{m}$  or less (Fujimaru, abstract.). Fujimaru discloses thermosetting compound including an epoxy functional group, including as epoxy compounds organopolysiloxanes with glycidyl

groups and silicone denatured epoxy compounds; and a polyamide is also disclosed in a comparative example. Col. 6, lines 13-39; Col. 10, lines 9-18.

Masahiko teaches a photosetting or thermosetting resin composition used in a multilayer printed wiring board. (Masahiko, abstract, English translation.). The thermosetting (photocurable) resin is disclosed to be epoxy compounds and/or (meth)acrylate crosslinking compounds. Masahiko, [0009], [0011] to [0015], and [0017] to [0022].

Applicants note that the Examiner has not rejected the limitations of Claims 4 or 21, the limitations of each of which has been included in Claims 28 and 30, over either Fujimaru or Masahiko, and thus the inclusion of these limitations should overcome the anticipatory rejections of Claims 28 and 30 over these references. Independent Claims 28 and 30 claim an article comprising an electrical component, the electrical component being an electrical conduction winding, stator bar, or a stator piece; neither Fujimaru nor Masahiko disclose these elements.

Further, as amended, neither Claims 28 nor 30 nor their dependents claim epoxy or acrylates as a thermosetting resin as disclosed in Fujimaru and Masahiko. Neither Fujimaru nor Masahiko disclose that the electrically insulating layer has a thickness of about 25 to about 300 micrometers and an electrical breakdown strength of greater than or equal to about 0.75 kilovolt as claimed in Claim 21, the limitations of which have been included in Claims 28 and 30, and therefore neither Fujimaru nor Masahiko disclose all limitations of independent Claims 28 and 30.

Fujimaru nor Masahiko thus do not anticipate Claims 28 and 30. Claims 29 and 31 depend upon Claims 28 and 30, respectively, thus are also patentable. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)/103(a)

Claims 1, 3-9, 13, 15, 24, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over United States Patent No. 6,869,683 to Sakurai et al., hereinafter “Sakurai”. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Sakurai teaches an electromagnetic wave absorber comprising an electromagnetic wave absorbing layer integrally laminated with an electromagnetic wave reflecting layer. (Sakurai Col. 2, lines 58-61) Sakurai discloses silicone resin as a dispersing medium. (Sakurai Col. 3, lines 64) Sakurai discloses an electromagnetic wave absorbing filler can be a soft magnetic ferrite such as Ni-Zn ferrite. (Sakurai Col. 6, line 66 to Col. 7, line 13) Sakurai discloses less than 5% by volume may fail to impart the desired electromagnetic wave absorbing ability. (Sakurai Col. 7, lines 40-41)

Applicants note that Claim 21, which claims that the electrically insulating layer has a thickness of about 25 to about 300 micrometers and an electrical breakdown strength of greater than or equal to about 0.75 kilovolt, and now used to modify Claims 1 and 24, has not been rejected over Sakurai, and therefore inclusion of the limitations of Claim 21 in these claims should render Claims 1 and 24 patentable over Sakurai.

Further, as earlier asserted in the previous response, Sakurai does not disclose an article comprising an electrical component, the electrical component being an electrical conduction winding, stator bar, or a stator piece, and therefore does not disclose all elements of the instant claims.

Because Sakurai does not teach every limitation of Claims 1 and 24, these claims are not anticipated by Sakurai or obvious over Sakurai, particularly so as these claims include limitations to a claim not rejected over Sakurai. Claims 3-9, 13, 15, and 27 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1 and 24, and thus are also not anticipated by or obvious over Sakurai. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10, 16, 25, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai. In light of the amendments to independent Claims 1 and 24 of with the limitations of Claim 21, which is not rejected as unpatentable over Sakurai, and in view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the obviousness rejections to dependent Claims 10, 16, 25, 26, and 32 over Sakurai are moot.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly,

reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection(s) and rejection(s) and allowance of the case are respectfully requested.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 07-0868.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /Dana A. Gronbeck/  
Dana A. Gronbeck  
Registration No. 55,226

Date: August 18, 2008  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
20 Church Street  
22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Hartford, CT 06103-3207  
Customer No. 23413